

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-13, 15, 17-20 are pending. Claims 2, 14 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15 and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner has withdrawn his rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112 due to amendment of claims.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulk, et al. ("Capability Maturity Model for Software, Version 1.1," Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, 1993), in view of Bowman-Amuah (Pat. No. 6,256,773).

The undersigned requests reconsideration of the rejection in view of the arguments and amendments submitted herein. The undersigned also acknowledges the Office's suggestion regarding an interview, but at this point feels that the current claims are patentable without additions thereto.

Rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paulk, et al. ("Capability Maturity Model for Software, Version 1.1," Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, 1993), in view of Bowman-Amuah (Pat. No. 6,256,773).

The independent claims have been amended as set forth herein to include language from the dependent claims directed to tracing of the organization's specific work products to the requirements of multiple maturity models. As is clearly recited in the specification, a prerequisite to consideration for many software development contracts is certification at a certain level within at least one established and recognized capability maturity model. The present invention facilitates ascertaining where a company is with respect to reaching this certification. Obviously, this would allow the company to determine if they were ready to apply for certification and what, if anything, the company needs to do internally before applying for certification, etc.

With this background, we turn to the cited prior art. The primary reference (Paulk) describes a single capability maturity model (CMM). Indeed, the cited article is the initial report describing the base concepts of the original CMM idea. Importantly, this primary reference does not describe multiple maturity models as required by the claims. Further, contrary to the assertions made in the Office Action, Paulk clearly does not describe any customer-specific work

products or numerous other claimed limitations involving table population, relating and the like.

While Paulk sets forth a model having defines levels and individual requirements for achieving those defined levels, Paulk falls well short of describing how the model is to be applied. In fact, referring to Page 43 of Paulk, the following makes clear that Paulk does not teach or suggest the application of the model (emphasis added):

This overview is not sufficient by itself for readers to conduct either an assessment or evaluation. Anyone wishing to apply the CMM through these methods should request further information on assessment and evaluation training.

The secondary reference to Bowman-Amuah likewise does not disclose the limitations that are missing from Paulk. Accordingly, the undersigned submits that this combination of references does not render the pending claims unpatentable.

CONCLUSION

The undersigned representative respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and such disposition is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution might be advanced by discussing the application with the undersigned representative, in person or over the telephone, we welcome the opportunity to do so. In addition, if any additional fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the same to Deposit Account 50-4402.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 8, 2010
King & Spalding LLP
1700 Pennsylvania Avenue
Suite 200
Washington DC 20006
(202) 626-8978

By: /Dawn-Marie Bey - 44,442/
Dawn-Marie Bey
Registration No. 44,442

14682/105618
Doc. No. 1420564